

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/730,987	12/06/2000	Geoffrey L. Turner	091451.00500	8191
34802 HOLLAND &	7590 10/01/2007 KNIGHT LLP	Geoffrey L. Turner	EXAMINER	
ATTN: STEFAN V. STEIN/ IP DEPT.		SPOONER, LAMONT M		
POST OFFICE TAMPA, FL 33			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
·			2626	
	•		<u> </u>	
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	09/730,987	TURNER, GEOFFREY L.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
•	Lamont M. Spooner	2626
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDON	ON. imely filed m the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 J This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under B	s action is non-final. ince except for formal matters, p	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-12,14-30,32-48,50-66 and 68-74 is 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-12,14-30,32-48,50-66 and 68-74 is 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 11 August 2005 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11.	a) accepted or b) objected or b) obj	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applica prity documents have been receiv nu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ition No ved in this National Stage
	,	,
Attachment(s)	4) 🔲 Interview Summar	n/PTO-413\
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s)/Mail I	

Art Unit: 2626

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/30/07 has been entered. Claims 1-12, 14-30, 32-48, 50-66, 68-74 are currently pending and have been examined.

Response to Arguments

- 2. Applicant's arguments filed 3/17/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 3. In response to applicant's arguments, "[T]he replacement language serves as a substitute for the corresponding preferred language when the descriptor does not have the descriptor value in the preferred language such that a descriptor value is needed for generating a language-specific output structure." "Fujita's translated sentences of it's Fig. 15 does not constitute a replacement language as a substitute for the corresponding

Application/Control Number: 09/730,987 Page 3

Art Unit: 2626

preferred language (i.e., the replacement language is not a predefined function of the preferred language). The Examiner cannot concur with these arguments. Fujita explicitly teaches, C.9 lines 13-31, a replacement language as substituting for the corresponding preferred language when the descriptor does not have the descriptor value in the preferred language such that a descriptor value is needed for generating a language-specific output structure, as evidenced by the word being a predefined function of the preferred language, as seen by Fujita's "Specified Language Chosen by Input of Indication Information mode" wherein the substitute/replacement language is a function of the preferred language by family relation. Thus the function is defined by his specified language and preferred language, or initial desired language of output. This output is also part of a languagespecific output structure, as shown in Fig. 15.

4. The Examiner notes applicant intended argued claims 1, 54, and 72 to recite "...replacement language serves as substitute...such that a descriptor value is needed...", and claims 18, and 36 to recite "...predefined function..." limitations.

Art Unit: 2626

Claim Objections

5. Claim 18 is objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 18, p.5, line 23, "exits" should probably be - -exists- -. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-20, 22-30, 32-38, 40-48, 50-54, and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herbert, III (herein referred to as Herbert, US Patent No. 6,018,742 Jan. 25, 2000) in view of Fujita (US 5,612,872).

As per **claim 1**, Herbert discloses a computer readable medium comprising a language database structure, comprising:

a descriptor database structure including at least one descriptor (Fig. 22-the ID 1000), at least one descriptor value for each descriptor wherein each descriptor value is expressed in a language (Fig. 22 Hammers, Pliers, Nails), and a language identifier for each descriptor value wherein the

Art Unit: 2626

language identifier identifies the language (Fig. 22 English, Spanish, French).

a preferred language identifier for identifying a user's preferred language based on information relating to the user (Fig. 22 item 248).

but lacks explicitly:

a replacement language database structure including at least one replacement language which serves as substitute for the corresponding preferred language when the descriptor does not have the descriptor value in the user's preferred language such that a descriptor value is needed for generating a language-specific output structure.

However, Fujita teaches a replacement language database structure including at least one replacement language...generating a language-specific output structure (Fig. 15, C.9.lines 15-31-evidenced by the substitute for the preferred language when the values is missing, wherein the value is necessary for generating the output, C.5.lines 12-17, Fig. 9 and C.6.line 6-part of his structure). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify Herbert by having a replacement language for his preferred language. The motivation for doing so would

Art Unit: 2626

have been to have a word without a preferred language translation, provided in a language more easily understood (C.4.lines 4-10).

As per **claim 2**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 2 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the language identifier is selected from the group consisting of a language name and a language symbol (Fig. 22 "English", 129, Fig. 23, Language_ID column, Fig. 24, Lang_ID, Lang_Name).

As per **claim 3**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 3 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the language identifier is a language pointer (C.11.lines 42-46, C.12.lines 9-59-language identifier points to language record containing relevant language information).

As per **claim 5**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 5 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the at least one descriptor, the at least one descriptor value for each descriptor, and the language identifier for each descriptor value are stored in a table (Fig. 22).

As per **claim 6**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 6 depends. Herbert further discloses:

Art Unit: 2626

the at least one descriptor and the at least one descriptor value for each descriptor are stored in a first table (Fig. 22 items 240, 244, 238, Fig. 22. items 246, and 232), and wherein the at least one descriptor value for each descriptor and the language identifier for each descriptor value are stored in a second table (Fig. 22 items 246, 248).

As per **claim 7**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 7 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the descriptor database structure comprises a table having a name that includes the language identifier, wherein descriptors and associated descriptor values expressed in the language are stored in the table, and wherein the table does not include a descriptor value expressed in another language that differs from the language (Fig. 22 each row table in item 242, row 1 columns 246, 248, 232, 234, 236, C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1, 2 "Each record is stored in a row of a respective table object, 30, and each field of that record is assigned to an appropriate column.", C.12.lines 25-40-each record does not include a descriptor value expressed in another language that differs from the language).

As per **claim 8**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 8 depends. Herbert further discloses:

Art Unit: 2626

a user database structure including at least one user identifier which identifies a user (Fig. 23 item 250).

As per **claim 9**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 9 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the preferred language identifier is selected from the group consisting of a preferred language name and a preferred language symbol (Fig. 23, Fig. 24, C.12.lines 53-59).

As per **claim 10**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 10 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the preferred language identifier is a preferred language pointer (C.12.lines 55-59).

As per claim 11, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 10, upon which claim 11 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the preferred language pointer points to the preferred language (C.12.lines 55-59-retrieving a language appropriate record).

Art Unit: 2626

As per **claim 12**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 10, upon which claim 12 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the preferred language pointer points to an algorithm which automatically determines the preferred language (Figs. 26, and 27-the algorithm for performing the program steps) based on stored information about a user and further wherein said stored information does not include the user's preferred language (C.14.lines 1-6-his geographical context identifier interpreted to identify user's preferred language-see context dependent discussion-C.15.lines 16-C.16.line 24, C.17.lines 10-14-France, Germany...French and German).

As per **claim 14**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 14 depends. Herbert further discloses:

an application database structure which includes: at least one output descriptor, wherein each output descriptor appears as a descriptor within the descriptor database structure (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23-unique fields, and numbers describing the fields located in the database); and an output zone of an output medium associated with each output descriptor

Art Unit: 2626

(C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23, C.9.lines 1-43,-the view screen and interface has unique column rows and fields identified by an output descriptor).

As per claim 15, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 14, upon which claim 15 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the output medium includes a screen display, and wherein each output zone identifies a portion of the screen display (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23, C.9.lines 1-43,-the view screen and interface has unique column rows and fields).

As per claim 16, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 15, upon which claim 16 depends. Herbert further discloses:

each output descriptor is of an output type selected from the group consisting of a screen title, a prompt, a help text, an error message, an instruction message, and an informational message (Fig. 3-output views, Figs. 4, 8, 10a, 22-output type includes informational message).

Art Unit: 2626

As per claim 17, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 14, upon which claim 17 depends. Herbert further discloses:

wherein the output medium includes a printed page, and wherein each output zone identifies a portion of the printed page (C.16.lines 34-39-the output medium is a printed page of the output, which includes the output zones as indicated previously).

As per claims 18 and 36, Herbert discloses a computer-implemented method of generating a language-specific output structure on an output medium, comprising the steps of:

providing a descriptor database structure including at least one descriptor (Fig. 22-the ID 1000), at least one descriptor value for each descriptor wherein each descriptor value is expressed in a language (Fig. 22 Hammers, Pliers, Nails), and a language identifier for each descriptor value wherein the language identifier identifies the language (Fig. 22 English, Spanish, French);

determining a user identifier of a user (Fig. 22 item 248, Fig. 23); identifying a preferred language based on the user identifier (Fig. 22 item 248, Fig. 23);

Art Unit: 2626

determining at least one output descriptor and associating with each output descriptor an output zone of the output medium (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23, C.9.lines 1-43,-the view screen and interface has unique column rows and fields identified by an output descriptor), wherein each output descriptor appears as a descriptor within the descriptor database structure (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23-unique fields, and numbers describing the fields located in the database);

generating a descriptor value for each output descriptor, by utilizing the preferred language and the descriptor database structure if a descriptor value for a preferred language exists (Fig. 22, C.12.lines 25-67, C.13.lines 1-10-each unique output descriptor value for each output descriptor is generated by the preferred or user identified preferred language and descriptor database structure); and

transferring the descriptor value for each output descriptor to the associated output zone of the output medium (Fig. 22 item 242, C.12.lines 40-65-the view, including the output zone of the output medium, includes the descriptor value for each output descriptor as described previously), but lacks explicitly:

Art Unit: 2626

providing a replacement language database structure, wherein said language database structure includes at least one replacement language which serves as replacement for a corresponding preferred language

generating a descriptor value by utilizing said replacement language for an output descriptor where no descriptor value exists for the preferred language with the replacement language being a predefined function of the preferred language

However, Fujita teaches a replacement language database structure, wherein said language database structure includes at least one replacement language which serves as replacement for a corresponding preferred language and generating a descriptor value by utilizing said replacement language for an output descriptor where no descriptor value exists for the preferred language, with the replacement language being a redefined function of the preferred language (Fig. 15, C.9.lines 15-31,evidenced by the word being a predefined function of the preferred language, as seen by Fujita's "Specified Language Chosen by Input of Indication Information mode" wherein the substitute/replacement language is a function of the preferred language by family relation. Thus the function is defined by his specified language and preferred language, or initial

Art Unit: 2626

desired language of output., C.5.lines 12-17, Fig. 9 and C.6.line 6-part of his structure). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify Herbert by having a replacement language. The motivation for doing so would have been to have a word without a preferred language translation, provided in a language more easily understood (C.4.lines 4-10).

As per claim 19 and 37, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 19 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the language identifier is selected from the group consisting of a language name and a language symbol (Fig. 22 "English", 129, Fig. 23, Language_ID column, Fig. 24, Lang_ID, Lang_Name).

As per claim 20 and 38, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 20 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the language identifier is a language pointer (C.11.lines 42-46, C.12.lines 9-59-language identifier points to language record containing relevant language information).

Art Unit: 2626

As per claim 22 and 40, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 22 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the step of providing a descriptor database structure comprises providing a table which includes the at least one descriptor (Fig. 22 items 246), the at least one descriptor value for each descriptor (Fig. 22 item 232), and the language identifier for each descriptor value (Fig. 22 item 248).

As per claim 23 and 41, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 23 depends. Herbert further discloses the step of providing a descriptor database structure comprises:

providing a first table which includes the at least one descriptor and the at least one descriptor value for each descriptor (Fig. 22 items 246, items 232); and

providing a second table which includes the at least one descriptor value for each descriptor and the language identifier for each descriptor value (Fig. 22 items 248, 232, 234, 236).

Art Unit: 2626

As per **claims 24 and 42**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 24 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the step of providing a descriptor database structure comprises providing a table having a name that includes the language identifier (Fig. 22 row table- "129 (English)"), wherein the table includes the descriptors and the associated descriptor values which are expressed in the language (Fig. 22 descriptor 1000, 1001, descriptor values Hammers, Pliers), and wherein the table does not include a descriptor value expressed in another language that differs from the language (Fig. 22 each row table in item 242, row 1 columns 246, 248, 232, 234, 236, C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1, 2 "Each record is stored in a row of a respective table object, 30, and each field of that record is assigned to an appropriate column.", C.12.lines 25-40-each record does not include a descriptor value expressed in another language that differs from the language).

As per claims 25 and 43, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 25 depends. Herbert further discloses:

Art Unit: 2626

the step of determining a user identifier includes prompting the user for information from which the user identifier may be ascertained (Fig. 23, C.14.lines 12-15).

As per claims 26 and 44, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 26 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the step of identifying a preferred language comprises identifying a preferred language identifier from a user database structure, said preferred language identifier being used to identify the preferred language, and said user database structure including (C.12.lines 40-67):

a list of user identifiers, said list including the user identifier of the user (Fig. 23); and

a preferred language identifier associated with each user identifier (Fig. 23).

As per claims 27 and 45, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 26, upon which claim 27 depends. Herbert further discloses:

Art Unit: 2626

the preferred language identifier is selected from the group consisting of a preferred language name and a preferred language symbol (Fig. 23, Fig. 24, C.12.lines 40-67, C.13.lines 1-27).

As per claims 28 and 46, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 26, upon which claim 28 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the preferred language identifier includes a preferred language pointer (C.12.lines 55-59).

As per claims 29 and 47, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 28, upon which claim 29 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the preferred language pointer points to the preferred language (Fig. 22, Fig 23, Fig. 24, C.12.lines 55-59, C.13.lines 1-27-the pointer points to the preferred language location for information retrieval).

As per claims 30 and 48, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 28, upon which claim 30 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the preferred language pointer points to an algorithm automatically determines the preferred language (Figs. 26, and 27-the algorithm for

Art Unit: 2626

performing the program steps) based on stored information about a user and further wherein said stored information does not include the user's preferred language (C.14.lines 1-6-his geographical context identifier interpreted to identify user's preferred language-see context dependent discussion-C.15.lines 16-C.16.line 24, C.17.lines 10-14-France, Germany...French and German).

As per claims 32 and 50, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 32 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the step of determining at least one output descriptor and associating with each output descriptor an output zone of the output medium comprises providing an

application database structure which includes (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23-unique fields, and numbers describing the fields located in the database, C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23, C.9.lines 1-43,-the view screen and interface has unique column rows and fields identified by an output descriptor):

the at least one output descriptor, wherein each output descriptor appears as a descriptor within the descriptor database structure (C.4.lines

Art Unit: 2626

63-67, C.5.lines 1-23-unique fields, and numbers describing the fields located in the database); and

the output zone of the output medium associated with each output descriptor (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23, C.9.lines 1-43,-the view screen and interface has unique column rows and fields identified by an output descriptor).

As per claims 33 and 51, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 33 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the output medium includes a screen display, and wherein each output zone identifies a portion of the screen display (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23, C.9.lines 1-43,-the view screen and interface has unique column rows and fields).

As per claims 34 and 52, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 33, upon which claim 34 depends. Herbert further discloses:

each output descriptor is of an output type selected from the group consisting of a screen title, a prompt, a help text, an error message, an

Art Unit: 2626

instruction message, and an informational message (Fig. 3-output views, Figs. 4, 8, 10a, 22-output type includes informational message).

As per claims 35 and 53, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 35 depends. Herbert further discloses:

wherein the output medium includes a printed page, and wherein each output zone identifies a portion of the printed page (C.16.lines 34-39-the output medium is a printed page of the output, which includes the output zones as indicated previously).

As per **claims 54**, Herbert discloses a computer system for generating a language-specific output structure on an output medium, comprising:

a processor; a memory device; an input device coupled to the processor; an output device coupled to the processor; a language database structure coupled to the processor; and a computer code located on the memory device (Fig. 29, C.16.lines 27-67, C.17.lines 1-14),

wherein the output device includes the output medium (Fig. 29 item 514, C.16.lines 34-41),

Art Unit: 2626

wherein the processor executes the computer code (C.16.lines 56-65),

wherein the language database structure includes a descriptor database structure (C.16.lines 27-67, C.17.lines 1-14, Fig. 22),

wherein the descriptor database structure includes at least one descriptor (Fig. 22 item 246), at least one descriptor value for each descriptor such that each descriptor value is expressed in a language (Fig. 22 item 232), and a language identifier for each descriptor value such that the language identifier identifies the language (Fig. 22 item 248), and wherein the computer code comprises an algorithm which includes:

determining a user identifier of a user (Fig. 22, 23, C.14.lines 10-14);

identifying a preferred language based on the user identifier (C.14.lines 10-14);

determining at least one output descriptor and associating with each output descriptor an output zone of the output medium (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23, C.9.lines 1-43,-the view screen and interface has unique column rows and fields identified by an output descriptor), wherein each output descriptor appears as a descriptor within the descriptor database

Art Unit: 2626

structure (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23-unique fields, and numbers describing the fields located in the database);

generating a descriptor value for each output descriptor, by utilizing the preferred language and the descriptor database structure if a descriptor value for the preferred language exists (Fig. 22, C.12.lines 25-67, C.13.lines 1-10-each unique output descriptor value for each output descriptor is generated by the preferred or user identified preferred language and descriptor database structure); and

transferring the descriptor value for each output descriptor to the associated output zone of the output medium (Fig. 22 item 242, C.12.lines 40-65-the view, including the output zone of the output medium, includes the descriptor value for each output descriptor as described previously) but lacks explicitly:

a replacement language database structure includes at least one replacement language which serves as substitute for the corresponding preferred language when the descriptor does not have the descriptor value in the user's preferred language such that a descriptor value is needed for generating a language-specific output structure, generating a descriptor

Art Unit: 2626

value by utilizing said replacement language for an output descriptor where no descriptor value exists for the preferred language.

However, Fujita teaches a replacement language database structure including at least one replacement language...generating a language-specific output structure (Fig. 15, C.9.lines 15-31-evidenced by the substitute for the preferred language when the values is missing, wherein the value is necessary for generating the output, C.5.lines 12-17, Fig. 9 and C.6.line 6-part of his structure)

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify Herbert by having a replacement language. The motivation for doing so would have been to have a word without a preferred language translation, provided in a language more easily understood (C.4.lines 4-10).

As per **claim 72**, Herbert discloses a computer program product, comprising:

a computer usable medium having a computer readable program code embodied therein for generating a language-specific output structure on an output medium (C.16.lines 27-65, C.17.lines 1-14),

wherein the computer readable program code comprises an algorithm which utilizes a language database structure(C.16.lines 56-65),

Art Unit: 2626

wherein the language database structure includes a descriptor database structure (Fig. 22, item 246),

wherein the descriptor database structure includes at least one descriptor (Fig. 22 item 246), at least one descriptor value for each descriptor such that each descriptor value is expressed in a language (Fig. 22 item 232), and a language identifier for each descriptor value such that the language identifier identifies the language (Fig. 22 item 248), and wherein the algorithm includes:

determining a user identifier of a user (Fig. 22, 23, C.14.lines 10-14);

identifying a preferred language based on the user identifier (C.14.lines 10-14);

determining at least one output descriptor and associating with each output descriptor an output zone of the output medium (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23, C.9.lines 1-43,-the view screen and interface has unique column rows and fields identified by an output descriptor), wherein each output descriptor appears as a descriptor within the descriptor database structure (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23-unique fields, and numbers describing the fields located in the database);

Application/Control Number: 09/730,987 Page 26

Art Unit: 2626

generating a descriptor value for each output descriptor, by utilizing the preferred language and the descriptor database structure if a descriptor value for a preferred language exists (Fig. 22, C.12.lines 25-67, C.13.lines 1-10-each unique output descriptor value for each output descriptor is generated by the preferred or user identified preferred language and descriptor database structure); and

transferring the descriptor value for each output descriptor to the associated output zone of the output medium (Fig. 22 item 242, C.12.lines 40-65-the view, including the output zone of the output medium, includes the descriptor value for each output descriptor as described previously) but lacks explicitly:

a replacement language database structure includes at least one replacement language which serves as substitute for the corresponding preferred language when the descriptor does not have the descriptor value in the user's preferred language such that a descriptor value is needed for generating a language-specific output structure, generating a descriptor value by utilizing said replacement language for an output descriptor where no descriptor value exists for the preferred language.

Art Unit: 2626

However, Fujita teaches a replacement language database structure including at least one replacement language...generating a language-specific output structure (Fig. 15, C.9.lines 15-31-evidenced by the substitute for the preferred language when the values is missing, wherein the value is necessary for generating the output, C.5.lines 12-17, Fig. 9 and C.6.line 6-part of his structure).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify Herbert by having a replacement language. The motivation for doing so would have been to have a word without a preferred language translation, provided in a language more easily understood (C.4.lines 4-10).

8. Claims 4, 21, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herbert in view of Fujita and further in view of Malatesta et al. (herein referred to as Malatesta, US Patent No. 5,442,782 Aug. 15, 1995).

As per **claim 4**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 4 depends. Herbert further discloses a first descriptor of the at least one descriptor has N.sub.1 descriptor values (Fig. 22-descriptor 1000 contains the descriptor values, HAMMERS, MARTILLO, MARTEAU), wherein a second descriptor of the at least one descriptor has

Art Unit: 2626

N.sub.2 descriptor values (Fig. 22-descriptor 1001 contains the descriptor values-PLIERS, ALICATES, PINCES), but the combination lacks disclosing N.sub.1 is unequal to N.sub.2.

However, Malatesta teaches (Fig. 3 item 336, C.4.lines 43-49)

N.sub.1. is unequal to N.sub.2. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify

Herbert by not requiring including an equal amount of descriptor values for each descriptor. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide recourse for when a related language record does not exist (C.4.lines 43-49).

As per claim 21 and 39, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 21 depends. Herbert further discloses a first descriptor of the at least one descriptor has N.sub.1 descriptor values (Fig. 22-descriptor 1000 contains the descriptor values, HAMMERS, MARTILLO, MARTEAU), wherein a second descriptor of the at least one descriptor has N.sub.2 descriptor values (Fig. 22-descriptor 1001 contains the descriptor values-PLIERS, ALICATES, PINCES), but the combination lacks disclosing N.sub.1 is unequal to N.sub.2.

Art Unit: 2626

However, Malatesta teaches (Fig. 3 item 336, C.4.lines 43-49)

N.sub.1. is unequal to N.sub.2. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify

Herbert by not requiring including an equal amount of descriptor values for each descriptor. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide recourse for when a related language record does not exist (C.4.lines 43-49).

- 9. Claims 55-66, and 68-71 fall within the scope of the previously rejected claims 1-53, and therefore are rejected by the same reasons.
- 10. Claims 73 and 74, fall within the scope of the previously rejected claims 1-53, and therefore are rejected by the same reasons.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lamont M. Spooner whose telephone number is 571/272-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor. Patrick Edouard can be reached on 571/272-7603.

Art Unit: 2626

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or

proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

lms 9/25/07 PATRICK N. EDOUARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 30